

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This case has been carefully reviewed and analyzed in view of the Official Action dated 5 October 2004. Responsive to the objections and rejections made in the Official Action, Claims 1, 5, 9, 10, and 14 have been amended to clarify the language thereof and the combination of elements which form the invention of the subject Patent Application.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to the drawings under 37 C.F.R. § 1.83(a), because the drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the Claims. The Examiner stated that the “image receiving key”, the “control circuit”, and the “computer” must be shown or the features cancelled from the claims.

Accordingly, Figures 3 – 6 and 10 have been amended to add a depiction of the image receiving key and/or the control circuit along with associated reference numerals. The “computer” has been cancelled from the claims and thus no drawing changes were required therefore.

In the Official Action, the Examiner objected to Claims 2 – 9 and 15 due to informalities therein. Of the objected to claims, only Claim 5 remains, and such has been amended to overcome the Examiner’s objection.

In the Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 1 – 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), as being anticipated by Yamada, U.S. Patent No. 5,282,064.

Before discussing the prior art reference relied upon by the Examiner, it is believed beneficial to first briefly discuss the method of the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed. The invention of the subject Patent Application is directed to a projection method of a real object projector. The real object projector includes a light source module which is either pivotally displaced from a position overlaying the base to receive the transparent film thereon, or withdrawn from the base to expose a support for the transparent film, the transparent film then being positioned thereon. It is believed that the method associated with that structure, is patentably distinguishable over the prior art.

In contradistinction, the Yamada reference is directed to an apparatus for simultaneous reading of reflective and light conductive portions of an original. Instruction provides two light source assemblies, one located below the original for the reading of the light conductive portions of the original, and a second light source whose output is reflected onto the original for reading of the reflective portions of the original. Nowhere does the reference disclose or suggest a structure, and a method associated therewith wherein the light source module is pivotally displaced from a position overlaying the base to receive the transparent film thereon. Quite the contrary, the reference discloses a base having one light source module affixed therein, the movable lamp assembly being disposed below the original object supporting plate 211 mounted in the upper surface of the base, and a second remotely located light source 107 that is not coupled to the base at

all. Nowhere is there a disclosure or suggestion of the step of pivotally displacing the light source module from a position overlaying the base to receive the transparent film thereon. The reference also fails to disclose the method where a light source module that is withdrawn from the base to expose a support for the transparent film, and positioning the transparent film thereon. As previously discussed, the support for the transparent film is exposed at the upper surface of the base, and is not withdrawn therefrom. Therefore, as the reference fails to disclose each and every one of the method steps of the invention of the subject Patent Application, as now claimed, it cannot anticipate that invention. Further, as the reference fails to suggest the combination of method steps of the invention of the subject Patent Application, and in fact teaches away from the method of the invention of the subject Patent Application, it cannot make obvious that invention, either.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is now believed that the subject Patent Application has been placed in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

FOR ROSENBERG, KLEIN & LEE

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "David I. Klein".

David I. Klein
Registration #33,253

Dated: 5 Jan. 2005

Rosenberg, Klein & Lee
Suite 101
3458 Ellicott Center Drive
Ellicott City, MD 21043
(410) 465-6678

Customer No.
04586

AMENDMENT TO THE DRAWINGS

The attached five drawing sheets include a change to each of Figs. 3, 4, 5, 6, and 10. Each of the five sheets respectively include a replacement for Figs. 3 – 6 and 10, which replaces the original sheets that include Figs. 3 – 6 and 10 thereon. The drawing sheets have been amended to add a representation of the “image receiving key” (52) and the “control circuit” (54) and their associated reference numerals. As the structures were described in the Specification, no new matter has been added by these changes.

Attachment: Five replacement sheets.